



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

This volume, however, issued in the year when Fielding, returned from Leyden, was in London at work on his play, contributes a hitherto unmentioned item to the "Wagstaffe" controversy, and perhaps also to the problem of Fielding's source. At least it suggests certain pertinent questions: What was the nature of the material added in this folio to the twenty-four octavo pages of the "Wagstaffe" pamphlet, and who wrote it? Was *Thomas Redivivus* a complete burlesque of the original *History*, somewhat in the manner of Ned Ward's *Hudibras Redivivus*: or was it a reprint of the *History* with a "spurious second and third part" newly added along with certain mock-critical apparatus? Does Ritson's comment mean that these additions, late in time, were so much in keeping with the original as to impose upon Thomas Hearne (died 1735)? Who was the author of the "spurious" parts? And who were the "Several Hands" responsible for the Annotations? May members of the Scriblerus Club have been responsible, Swift, perhaps, among others? And who was dealt with in the prefixed "historical and critical Remarks on the Life and Writings of the Author": Was this the original "Wagstaffe" memoir, or a new burlesque on writings of that nature? My present bibliographical environment makes any attempt to answer these questions impossible to me; but cannot others more fortunately situated do better? I can only suggest that this bulky work appearing in the very year when, according to Professor Cross, Fielding was making the acquaintance of literary London, would seem more likely to have attracted the playwright's attention than the pamphlet of 1711. Some hint as to the authorship might even have reached him and stirred his interest.

HELEN SARD HUGHES.

*The University of Iowa.*

---

*THE DRAMATIC RECORDS OF SIR HENRY HERBERT.*

By Joseph Quincy Adams. Cornell Studies in English. Yale University Press, New Haven, 1917.

Professor Joseph Quincy Adams, in *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert*, has done serviceable work in a field which cries for organization. The documents illustrating the history of the English drama and theatre number many thousands; they are being added to yearly; and they lie scattered through the writings of half a hundred scholars. To assemble and arrange them in one great corpus, with indices, would be a formidable undertaking, but one fraught with relief to the laboring scholar. For even a partial ordering of these materials one breathes a prayer of gratitude.

The present compilation is evidently and avowedly inspired by Professor Feuillerat's editions of the Revels Accounts for Edward VI, Mary, and Elizabeth. Most unfortunately the chain of these records is broken just at the point where we would prize it most—during the fruitful first two decades of the 17th century—whence have come down to us only a few precious fragments. But with the entry of Henry Herbert into the mastership of the Revels in July, 1623, the continuity of records resumes. As every one knows, the Office Book of Herbert, like that of Sir George Buc, has disappeared; yet luckily not before it was known and studied by two faithful scholars, Edmund Malone and George Chalmers, and through their liberal citations preserved to the world. These quotations, covering the period 1622-1642, give an invaluable framework on which to build the dramatic history of those years.

Professor Adams has undertaken to gather from printed sources all evidences relating to the theatrical activities of Herbert. Thus he has not only reassembled the Office Book, but he has printed a half-dozen miscellaneous documents relating to Herbert and the Revels Office prior to 1642, and above forty documents relating to similar activities between 1660 and his death in 1673. The sources of these materials are chiefly comprised in Malone's *History of the Stage*, Chalmers' *Apology* and *Supplementary Apology*, Halliwell-Phillipps' *Collection of Ancient Documents Respecting the Office of the Revels*, and Rebecca Warner's *Epistolary Curiosities*.

The collection is divided into three parts: *The Office Book 1622-1642*; *Miscellaneous Documents, 1622-1642*; and *Miscellaneous Documents, 1642-1673*. The entries of the first section are conveniently classified under such headings as *Censorship of Plays*, *Licenses of Plays*, *Licenses for the Press*, *Licenses of Playhouses and Companies*, *Plays and Masques at Court*. There are copious footnotes dealing with identities of plays, first performances, authorship, actors, and theatres, wherein the voice of Frederic Gard Fleay, not undisputed, is nevertheless dominant. The second section of miscellaneous documents between 1622 and 1642 contains unimportant business data aside from two lists of plays acted at Court by the King's Company, 1636-1639. The third section of miscellaneous documents between 1660 and 1673 presents vividly the story of Herbert's fight to gain back his office and his licensing authority, his partial success, his lawsuits with Davenant and Killigrew, and his compounding with Killigrew. It includes also documents relating more directly to the history of the drama, like the list of plays acted by the King's Company between 1660 and 1662. This section makes an invaluable beginning for the study of the Restoration stage and drama of the transitional period.

It remains to note the thorough-going index of sixteen pages, and our survey is complete. Professor Adams in this case, as always with him, has done a conscientious, workmanlike job. Within its scope it is complete. To the historians of the censorship and the theatre it is equally welcome. One could wish, however, that he had extended back to include the desultory scraps of Revels Accounts that lie between the present compilation and Feuillerat's, so as to complete the orderly edition of the Accounts. And we must not forget that Professor Adams has only reprinted documents which have been printed before. The Restoration period remains a storehouse of unpublished evidences which has been scarcely tapped. I remember that in 1912 Dr. Watson Nicholson, who was working with me in the Public Records Office, London, told me that he was collecting quantities of such materials in the Lord Chamberlain's Office. Too busy then to verify his statements, I have been looking ever since for the appearance of these buried jewels—in vain.

HAROLD N. HILLEBRAND.

*University of Illinois.*

---

*THE REALISTIC PRESENTATION OF AMERICAN CHARACTERS IN NATIVE AMERICAN PLAYS PRIOR TO EIGHTEEN SEVENTY.* By Perley Isaac Reed, Ph.D. *The Ohio State University Bulletin*, Vol. XXII, Number 26. Columbus, May, 1918. Pp. 168.

A new treatise on the older American drama is always of interest to those who desire to see the literature of this country investigated in all its branches. The number of such treatises has shown an encouraging increase during the last few years. It must be admitted that the material with which they deal makes, with a few exceptions, a scholarly rather than an artistic appeal, for our earlier plays as a whole have even less claim to permanence than those of the last four or five decades. Nevertheless the older dramatists are worthy of close attention because their work reflects the taste of their time and often throws some light on the social and political conditions of a past epoch.

Dr. Reed's study is based on the latter consideration; in his own words, it was undertaken "with the object of determining to what extent, in what manner, and with what fidelity these playwrights have drawn their characters from distinctive American life, just as it actually was, during the different historical periods prior to 1870." Starting his investigation with the middle of the eighteenth century, when play writing really began in the colonies, Dr. Reed proceeds to the year of